



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/747,994	12/30/2003	Ashfaq Parkar	USAV2003/0073 US NP	6604
5487	7590	04/06/2006	EXAMINER	
ROSS J. OEHLER AVENTIS PHARMACEUTICALS INC. 1041 ROUTE 202-206 MAIL CODE: D303A BRIDGEWATER, NJ 08807			LANDSMAN, ROBERT S	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1647	
DATE MAILED: 04/06/2006				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/747,994

Applicant(s)

PARKAR ET AL.

Examiner

Robert Landsman

Art Unit

1647

– The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address –

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-46 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-46 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Election/Restriction

A. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-14, 22-25, 30-39 and 42, drawn to a polynucleotide, vector, host cells, and method of making protein, classified in class 435, subclass 69.1.
- II. Claim 15-21, drawn to a polypeptide, classified in class 530, subclass 350.
- III. Claims 26-29, drawn to an antibody, classified in class 530, subclass 387.1
- IV. Claim 40, drawn to antisense, classified in class 514, subclass 44.
- V. Claim 41, drawn to a transgenic animal, classified in class 800, subclass 8.
- VI. Claim 43, drawn to a method of detecting protein using antibody, classified in class 435, subclass 7.1.
- VII. Claims 44-46, drawn to a method of identifying receptor ligands, classified in class 435, subclass 7.2.

B. The inventions are distinct, each from each other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I, II, III, IV, V are independent and distinct, each from each other, because they are products which possess characteristic differences in structure and function and each has an independent utility that is distinct for each invention which cannot be exchanged.

The polypeptide of **Group II** and the polynucleotide of **Group I** are patentably distinct for the following reasons: polypeptides, which are composed of amino acids, and polynucleotides, which are composed of purine and pyrimidine units, are structurally distinct molecules; any relationship between a polypeptide and polynucleotide is dependent upon the information provided by the nucleic acid sequence open reading frame as it corresponds to the primary amino acid sequence of the encoded polypeptide.

Furthermore, searching the inventions of **Groups I and II** together would impose a serious search burden. In the instant case, the search of the polypeptides and the polynucleotides is not coextensive. The inventions of **Groups I and II** have a separate status in the art as shown by their different classifications. In cases such as this one where descriptive sequence information is provided, the sequences are searched in appropriate databases. There is also search burden in the non-patent literature. Prior to the concomitant isolation and expression of the sequence of interest there may be journal articles devoted solely to polypeptides which would not have described the polynucleotide. Similarly, there may have been "classical" genetics papers which had no knowledge of the polypeptide, but spoke to the gene.

Art Unit: 1647

Searching, therefore, is not coextensive. As such, it would be burdensome to search the inventions of **Groups I and II**.

The polypeptide of **Group II** and the antibody of **Group III** are patentably distinct for the following reasons: while the inventions of both **Groups II and III** are polypeptides, in this instance, the polypeptide of **Group II** is a single chain molecule that functions as a **receptor**, whereas the polypeptide of **Group III** encompasses antibodies including IgG which comprises 2 heavy and 2 light chains containing constant and variable regions, including framework regions which act as a scaffold for the 6 complementary determining regions (CDRs) that function to bind an epitope. Thus, the polypeptide of **Group II** and the antibody of **Group III** are structurally distinct molecules; any relationship between a polypeptide of **Group II** and an antibody of **Group III** is dependent upon the correlation between the scope of the polypeptides that the antibody binds and the scope of the antibodies that would be generated upon immunization with a polypeptide.

In this case, the polypeptide of **Group II** is a large molecule which contains potentially hundreds of regions to which an antibody must bind, whereas the antibody of **Group III** is defined in terms of its binding specificity to a small structure within **the disclosed SEQ ID NO**. Thus, immunization with the polypeptide of **Group II** would result in the production of antibodies outside the scope of **Group III**. Therefore, the polypeptide and antibody are patentably distinct.

Furthermore, searching the inventions of **Group II** and **Group III** would impose a serious search burden. The inventions have a separate status in the art as shown by their different classifications. A polypeptide and antibody which to the polypeptide require different searches. An amino acid search of the full-length protein is necessary for a determination of novelty and unobviousness of the protein. However, such a search is not required to identify the antibodies of **Group III**. Furthermore, antibodies which bind to an epitope of a polypeptide of **Group II** may be known even if a polypeptide of **Group II** is novel. In addition, the technical literature search for the polypeptide of **Group II** and the antibody of **Group III** is not coextensive, e.g. antibodies may be characterized in the technical literature prior to discovery of, or sequencing of, their binding target.

The polynucleotide of **Group I** and the antibody of **Group III** are patentably distinct for the following reasons: the antibody of **Group III** includes, for example, IgG which comprises 2 heavy and 2 light chains containing constant and variable regions, including framework regions which act as a scaffold for the 6 complementary determining regions (CDRs). Polypeptides, such as the antibody of **Group III** which are composed of amino acids, and polynucleotides, which are composed of nucleic acids, are structurally distinct molecules. Any relationship between a polynucleotide and polypeptide is dependent

Art Unit: 1647

upon the information provided by the nucleic acid sequence open reading frame as it corresponds to the primary amino acid sequence of the encoded polypeptide. In the present claims, a polynucleotide of **Group I** will not encode an antibody of **Group III**, and an antibody of **Group III** cannot be encoded by a polynucleotide of **Group I**. Therefore, the antibody and polynucleotide are patentably distinct.

The antibody and polynucleotide inventions have a separate status in the art as shown by their different classifications. Furthermore, searching the inventions of **Groups I** and **III** would impose a serious search burden since a search of the polynucleotide of **Group I** would not be used to determine the patentability of an antibody of **Group III** and vice-versa.

The antisense polynucleotides of **Group IV** has a function of blocking protein production, which is distinct from the function of the sense polynucleotides of **Group I**, which is to produce protein. The sequences of the polynucleotides of **Groups I** and **IV** are not necessarily overlapping.

The transgenic animals of **Group V** are distinct from polynucleotide, polypeptides, pharmaceutical compositions and gene chips.

Invention **I**, **II**, **IV**, **V** are unrelated to Invention **VI** because the product of **Groups I**, **II**, **IV**, **V** are not used or otherwise involved in the processes of **Group VI**.

Inventions **III** and **VI** are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the antibody can be used to purify protein.

Invention **I**, **III**, **IV**, **V** are unrelated to Invention **VII** because the product of **Groups I**, **III**, **IV**, **V** are not used or otherwise involved in the processes of **Group VI**.

Inventions **II** and **VI** are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the protein can be used to make antibodies.

Inventions **VI** and **VII** are independent and distinct, each from the other, because the methods are practiced with materially different process steps for materially different purposes and each method requires a non-coextensive search because of different starting materials, process steps and goals.

Art Unit: 1647

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification and recognized divergent subject matter as defined by MPEP § 808.02, the Examiner has *prima facie* shown a serious burden of search (see MPEP § 803). Therefore, an initial requirement of restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. **Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product** will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of *In re Ochiai*, *In re Brouwer* and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.**

Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Art Unit: 1647

C. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Applicant is reminded that upon cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR § 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a diligently-filed petition under 37 CFR § 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR § 1.17 (h).

Advisory information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert Landsman whose telephone number is (571) 272-0888. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 10 AM – 7 PM (eastern); alt F 10 AM – 6 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brenda Brumback can be reached on 571-272-0961. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


ROBERT S. LANDSMAN, PH.D.
PRIMARY EXAMINER